



specific decision denying him parole, he must pursue his claims in an action for federal habeas corpus relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Preiser v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475 (1973).

Given the liberal standard of review for *pro se* pleadings, this Court could convert plaintiff's complaint to a habeas corpus petition. See Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972). However, a great deal of information is required for a habeas corpus petition that is not supplied in the instant complaint. See Rules Governing § 2254 Cases. Moreover, a habeas corpus petitioner is required to exhaust state court remedies before seeking relief in the federal courts. Rose v. Lundy, 455 U.S. 509 (1982). In this regard, there has been no showing that the plaintiff has ever presented his claim to the state courts for review prior to the filing of this complaint. Therefore, it would not be appropriate for the Court to treat the instant complaint as a § 2254 petition.

After careful review of the complaint, the Court finds that the plaintiff has failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Under such circumstances, the Court is obliged to dismiss the complaint *sua sponte*. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

An appropriate Order will be entered.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert L. Echols", written in a cursive style.

Robert L. Echols  
United States District Judge